

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

JONAS LAVARUS ROGERS,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 23-cv-13073

Hon. Matthew F. Leitman

v.

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE, *et al.*,

Defendants.

---

**ORDER DISMISSING PLAINTIFF’S**  
**COMPLAINT (ECF No. 1) WITHOUT PREJUDICE**

On December 5, 2023, Plaintiff Jonas Lavarus Rogers filed this action against Defendant the Internal Revenue Service (the “IRS”) and the Commissioner of the IRS. (*See* Compl., ECF No. 1.) The Court subsequently granted Rogers *in forma pauperis* status, and it directed him to complete certain documents and return them to the Clerk of the Court so that the United States Marshal could serve his Complaint on the Defendants (the “Service Order”). (*See* Service Order, ECF No. 6.) The Court also issued an order informing Rogers that pursuant to Local Rule 11.2, he was required to “promptly file a notice with the Clerk and serve a copy of the notice on all parties whenever [their] address[es], e-mail address[es], phone number[s] and/or other contact information changes” (the “Change of Address Order”). (*See* Change of Address Order and Certificate of Service, ECF No. 4, PageID.22, citing E.D.

Mich. Local Rule 11.2.) The Court warned Rogers in the Change of Address Order that the “failure to promptly notify the court of a change in address or other contact information may result in the **dismissal** of [his] case.” (*Id.*; emphasis in original).

On December 19, 2023, the Change of Address Order was returned to the Court as undeliverable. (*See* ECF No. 7.) The failure by a plaintiff to update his contact information is not a mere technical violation of the rules. Without a current address or accurate contact information, the Court has no way of administering this civil action. In addition, Rogers has taken no action to respond to the Service Order. He has not completed the service documents required by the Court. Nor has he contacted the Court to ask for additional time to complete those documents.

Accordingly, because Rogers has failed to comply with Local Rule 11.2 by updating his current address, and because Rogers has failed to prosecute this action and complete the required service documents, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** Rogers’ Complaint (ECF No. 1) is **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/Matthew F. Leitman  
MATTHEW F. LEITMAN  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated: February 5, 2024

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was served upon the parties and/or counsel of record on February 5, 2024, by electronic means and/or ordinary mail.

s/Holly A. Ryan

Case Manager

(313) 234-5126